

Application No. 09/980582
Amendment dated 30 March 2006
Reply to Office Action of 27 January 2006

Page 10 of 15

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 17-33 were pending prior to this paper. In this paper, the Applicant has further amended the application by:

- cancelling claims 7-10, 12, 19, 22-24, 26, 29, 30 and 32;
- amending claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 11, 17, 18, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 31 and 33; and
- adding new claims 34-46.

The amendments to claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 11, 17, 18, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 31 and 33 and the subject matter of new claims 34-46 are submitted to contain no new matter and to be completely supported by the application as filed.

As a result of these amendments, claims 1-6, 11, 17, 18, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 31 and 33-46 are currently pending.

A Request for Continued Examination is filed together herewith.

Claims 1, 3, 17, 21 and 25

At paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has raised US patent No. 6,052,780 (Glover) in connection with claims 1, 3, 17, 21 and 25. The Applicant submits that claims 1, 3, 17, 21 and 25 (as amended) patentably distinguish Glover.

As understood by the Applicant, Glover discloses storing encrypted digital information as an executable computer program which includes a decryption program that decrypts the encrypted digital information to provide the desired digital information. upon successful completion of an authorization procedure by the user. The authorization procedure enables the digital information to be distributed for a limited number of uses and/or users, thus enabling per-use fees to be charged for the digital information.

Claim 1, as amended, recites the combination of "receiving a file at a user computing device, the file comprising an integral decryption engine and encrypted media content; requesting a decryption key from a remote server; receiving the decryption key from the remote server, the decryption key itself encrypted with a user key, the user key bonded to the user computing device by being based at least in part on one or more

Application No. 09/980582
Amendment dated 30 March 2006
Reply to Office Action of 27 January 2006

Page 11 of 15

characteristics of the user computing device such that the user computing device can use the user key to decrypt the decryption key; and responding to receipt of said decryption key from said remote server by: decrypting said media content using said integral decryption engine and the decryption key." Glover fails to disclose this combination of features. More particularly, Glover does not teach or suggest receiving a decryption key from a remote server where "the decryption key itself encrypted with a user key, the user key bonded to the user computing device by being based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the user computing device such that only the user computing device can use the user key to decrypt the decryption key" as recited in claim 1.

Glover describes an example authorization procedure at col. 21, ln. 18-52. In this example, when a DVD player determines that a DVD disk is being played for the first time, the player displays a numeric identifier for the DVD disk and a phone number for a user to call. To authenticate him or herself, the user calls the phone number and provides the numeric identifier, whereupon the content provider provides the user with a password. The user inputs the password into the DVD player to complete the authentication procedure. Glover does not disclose that this password is itself encrypted. Glover does not disclose that anything other than this password is received from the content provider or from any other source during the authentication procedure. Accordingly, Glover fails to teach or suggest the claim 1 feature of receiving a decryption key from a remote server where "the decryption key itself encrypted with a user key, the user key bonded to the user computing device by being based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the user computing device such that the user computing device can use the user key to decrypt the decryption key".

Based on this reasoning, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patentably distinguishes Glover. Claims 3, 17, 21 and 25 depend from claim 1 and are submitted to be allowable for at least this reason.

Application No. 09/980582
Amendment dated 30 March 2006
Reply to Office Action of 27 January 2006

Page 12 of 15

Claims 2, 18 and 20

At paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner has raised the combination of Glover and US patent No. 6,564,248 (Budge et al.) in connection with claims 2, 18 and 20. The Applicant submits that claims 2, 18 and 20 (as amended) patentably distinguish the combination of Glover and Budge et al.

Claims 2, 18 and 20 depend from claim 1. As discussed above, Glover does not disclose the claim 1 feature of receiving a decryption key from a remote server where "the decryption key itself encrypted with a user key, the user key bonded to the user computing device by being based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the user computing device" such that the user computing device can use the user key to decrypt the decryption key". Budge et al. fail to remedy this deficiency.

Accordingly, claims 2, 18 and 20 are submitted to patentably distinguish the combination of Glover and Budge et al.

Claim 27

At paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner has raised the combination of Glover and US patent No. 6,385,596 (Wiser et al.) in connection with claim 27. The Applicant submits that claim 27 (as amended) patentably distinguishes the combination of Glover and Wiser et al.

Claim 27 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, Glover does not disclose the claim 1 feature of receiving a decryption key from a remote server where "the decryption key itself encrypted with a user key, the user key bonded to the user computing device by being based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the user computing device" such that the user computing device can use the user key to decrypt the decryption key". Wiser et al. fail to remedy this deficiency.

Accordingly, claim 27 is submitted to patentably distinguish the combination of Glover and Wiser et al.

Application No. 09/980582
Amendment dated 30 March 2006
Reply to Office Action of 27 January 2006

Page 13 of 15

Claims 4-6, 11, 28 and 31

At paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has raised the combination of Glover and Budge et al. in connection with claims 4-6, 11, 28 and 31. The Applicant submits that claims 4-6, 11, 28 and 31 (as amended) patentably distinguish the combination of Glover and Budge et al.

Claim 4 recites the combination of "receiving a single file at a user computing device, the single file comprising an integral decryption engine, encrypted media content and integral media playback software, the single file executable independently of other programs to: obtain a decryption key from a remote server, the decryption key itself encrypted with a user key, the user key bonded to the user computing device by being based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the user computing device such that the user computing device can use the user key to decrypt the decryption key; decrypt the media content using the integral decryption engine and the decryption key; and view the media content using the integral media playback software."

Neither Glover nor Budge et al., alone or in combination, disclose these claim 4 features. More particularly, as discussed above in relation to claim 1, Glover does not teach or suggest the claim 4 feature of obtaining "a decryption key from a remote server, the decryption key itself encrypted with a user key, the user key bonded to the user computing device by being based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the user computing device such that the user computing device can use the user key to decrypt the decryption key". Budge et al. fail to remedy this deficiency.

Based on this reasoning, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 patentably distinguishes Glover. Claims 5, 6, 11, 28 and 31 depend from claim 4 and are submitted to be allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 33

At paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner has raised the combination of Glover, Budge et al. and Wiser et al. in connection with claim 33. The Applicant submits that claim 33 (as amended) patentably distinguishes the combination of Glover, Budge et al. and Wiser et al.

Application No. 09/980582
Amendment dated 30 March 2006
Reply to Office Action of 27 January 2006

Page 14 of 15

Claim 33 depends from claim 4. As discussed above, neither Glover nor Budge et al., alone or in combination, disclose the claim 4 feature of obtaining "a decryption key from a remote server, the decryption key itself encrypted with a user key, the user key bonded to the user computing device by being based at least in part on one or more characteristics of the user computing device such that the user computing device can use the user key to decrypt the decryption key". Wiser et al. fail to remedy this deficiency.

Accordingly, claim 33 is submitted to patentably distinguish the combination of Glover, Budge et al. and Wiser et al.

Claims 34-45

The Applicant has added new claims 34-45. New claims 34-45 are submitted to contain no new matter and to be completely supported by the application as filed.

Claims 34-42 depend from claim 1 and are submitted to patentably distinguish the prior art of record for at least this reason. Claims 43-45 depend from claim 4 and are submitted to patentably distinguish the prior art of record for at least this reason.

The Applicant submits that claims 35, 42 and 44 further distinguish the prior art of record because these claims recite the feature of "using the user key to decrypt the decryption key and to thereby obtain a decrypted decryption key". As understood by the Applicant, none of the prior art of record discloses receiving (from a remote server) a decryption key that is itself encrypted with a user key that is based on characteristic(s) of the user computing device. Furthermore, none of the prior art of record discloses subsequently using the user key to decrypt the decryption key and to thereby obtain a decrypted decryption key as recited in claims 35, 42 and 44.

Claim 46

The Applicant has added new independent claim 46. New claim 46 is submitted to contain no new matter and to be completely supported by the application as filed. New claim 46 is submitted to patentably distinguish the prior art of record.

Application No. 09/980582
Amendment dated 30 March 2006
Reply to Office Action of 27 January 2006

Page 15 of 15

Conclusions

The Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application in light of the foregoing amendments and comments.

Respectfully submitted,
OYEN WIGGS GREEN & MUTALA LLP

By: 

Gavin N. Manning
Registration No. 36,412
tel: 604.669.3432
fax: 604.681.4081